UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,935	02/25/2004	Paul Tzeng	3313-1119P	9554
	7590 10/01/2007 ART KOLASCH & BIRCI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747			LE, THI Q	
FALLS CHUR	CH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
* •			. 2613	
			(
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/01/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/784,935	TZENG ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Thi Q. Le	2613				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RI	EPLV IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 M	MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS				
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatio - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by s Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUN R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO statute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. I reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	27 March 2007.					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice und	der <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims		•				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-8</u> is/are pending in the ap	oplication.	·				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-8</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.					
Application Papers	•					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	miner.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>25 February 2004</u> i	s/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□	objected to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeya	ince. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co						
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents	nents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority document		Application No.				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the						
application from the International Bu	ıreau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies no	t received.				
		•				
Attachment(s)	•					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)				
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 	·	(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other: _	<u>.</u>				

Art Unit: 2613

DETAILED ACTION

This Action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 3/27/2007. Claims 1, 3-8 are still pending in the present application. This Action is made FINAL

Priority -

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35
 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d).

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) filed on 10/11/2006, 12/13/2006 was considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Application/Control Number: 10/784,935 Page 3

Art Unit: 2613

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 6. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Britz (US PGPub 200402022474) in view of Agurok et al. (US Patent # 6,369,925) and further in view of Ruziak (US Patent # 6,907,013.

Consider **claim 1**, Britz discloses a wireless signal transmission and receiving system applied for a display device for receiving wireless signals omni directionally, comprising:

a plurality of transmitting units from multiple sources for sending optical signals via optical beams (figures 2 shows the process of electrically combining multiplex independent data signals through the use of an Electrical multiplexer 81, paragraph 0023; figure 3 shows the process of creating redundant optical signals, paragraph 0026); and

a plurality of receiving units for collecting redundant optical signals (figure 3 shows, there are a plurality of receiving units, one for each wavelength. For example optical/electrical converter 66 and 68, for receiving the two redundant wavelengths shown; paragraph 0027),

Application/Control Number: 10/784,935

Art Unit: 2613

wherein each of the receiving units further comprises a photodiode for converting the single optical signal into the electrical signal (Britz discloses, the optical/electrical converter 66 and 68 are photodiodes; figure 3, paragraph 0027).

Britz discloses first converting the redundant optical signals into electrical signal then combining the electrical signals, but fails disclose combining the redundant optical signals to a single optical signal; and fails to disclose, inputting the electrical signal into a displace device.

It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the teaching of Britz from first converting optical signals into electrical signals then combining the electrical signals, to first combine the optical signals then convert the optical signal into an electrical signal, since the applicant has not disclosed that the process of firstly combing the optical signals then converting the optical signal into electrical signal is critical versus the process of first converting the optical signals into electrical signals then combining the electrical signals. Further, Agurok discloses, the procession of first combining the optical signals then converting the optical signal into electrical signal, shown on figure 3, column 6 lines 20-31. Thus, it would have been obvious that the modification to the teaching of Britz, would have achieved the same result.

In related art, Ruziak discloses a wireless communication system for multi media devices. The system includes a remote unit 24 that is connected to the television set 28, wherein the remote unit 24 is configured to receives cable television signal from base unit 22 and converting the signal for displaying on the television set 29; figure 1 column 7 lines 1-10.

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Ruziak with Agurok et al. Since Ruziak provides a high-speed communication link capable of supporting interactive multimedia transmission.

Application/Control Number: 10/784,935

Art Unit: 2613

Consider claim 3, and as applied to claim 1 above, Britz as modified by Agurok and Ruziak further disclose, wherein the transmitting units further comprises beam forming optics (Britz discloses, the transmitting side includes optical telescope 58; figure 3, paragraph 0026).

Consider claim 4, and as applied to claim 1 above, Britz as modified by Agurok and Ruziak further disclose, wherein the receiving units further comprises beam collecting optics (Britz discloses, the receiving side includes optical telescope 62, figure 3, paragraph 0027).

Consider claim 5, and as applied to claim 1 above, Britz as modified by Agurok further disclose, except for, wherein the optical signals are converted from audio and video source devices.

In related art, Ruziak disclose, a wireless communication system, wherein the optical signals are converted from audio and video source devices (read as, optical communication signals from the television 28 and baser unit 22; figures 1a-c) (figures 1a-c; column 6 lines 43-54).

It would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Ruziak with Agurok et al. Since Ruziak provides a high-speed communication link capable of supporting interactive multimedia transmission.

Consider claim 6, and as applied to claim 1 above, Britz as modified by Agurok and Ruziak further disclose,, wherein the optical signals are converted from computers (read as, optical communication signals from the personal data assistant 29 and baser unit 22; Ruziak, figures 1a-c) (Ruziak, figures 1a-c; column 6 lines 50-55).

Consider claims 7 and 8, and as applied to claim 1 above, Britz as modified by Agurok and Ruziak further disclose, wherein the optical signals are analog or digital in nature (read as,

Application/Control Number: 10/784,935 Page 6

Art Unit: 2613

IR communication links may carry either digital or analog data; Ruziak) (Ruziak, column 3 lines 34-36).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any response to this Office Action should be faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Customer Service Window Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22314

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Thi Le whose telephone number is (571) 270-1104. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Kenneth Vanderpuye can be reached on (571) 272-3078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Thi Le

KENNETH VANDERPUYE

Page 8